

is get the best of what everyone has to offer. When people write to me and say support the President, I say this is not about the President, it is not about me; it is about this country's future: What are the best ideas to ensure this country's economic future? What are the best ideas we can get from Republicans and Democrats to ensure economic growth and opportunity for all Americans?

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, let me first thank the clerks who have been kind enough to notify me I might come over at this time. I am most appreciative of that courtesy. I will try to keep my remarks short. I recognize it is Friday afternoon and Members are anxious to be on their way.

#### THE ENERGY BILL

Mr. MURKOWSKI. The purpose of addressing my colleagues today is to talk a little bit about the energy bill. As most Members know, a bipartisan bill was introduced by Senator BREAUX and myself some time ago. It was a very comprehensive energy bill. It covered all aspects of renewables, alternatives, conservation, and also went into what we think is very important, and that is the issue of supply because what we have in this country—and it is certainly evident in California and moving out to New York and other areas—is we have increased consumption. In other words, we increased demand but we have not increased the supply.

This particular bill attempts to not only, in the sense of renewables, encourage alternatives and conservation, but it addresses how we can go back to our conventional sources of energy and try to do a more efficient job of ensuring that they, too, continue to contribute to our needs.

That sounds simplistic in one sense, but in another it should be recognized we have not been able to build a new coal-fired plant in the United States since the mid-1990s. It is not that we do not have the coal or the method of transporting the coal; it is simply a matter of permitting and the difficulties associated with meeting air quality and the costs associated with the particular type of construction required to meet the new emission standards.

We have not built a new nuclear plant in this country in over 25 years. Nobody in their right mind would even approach the subject because of, first,

permitting, but probably even more pertinent is the difficulty of what we do with the high level radioactive wastes. We have been working out in Nevada for the last decade building a repository that is still 6 to 8 years away, even though it is basically complete today. The permitting is taking that long. It is at Yucca Mountain. We have expended over \$7 billion.

My point is simple. As we address our conventional sources, we find we have eliminated them for one reason or another simply because we have not had the conviction to overcome the objections by some groups that do not want to see nuclear and they do not want to see coal. It is pretty hard to identify what their contribution is to the recognition that we are short of supply.

You can go on into hydro, which is renewable, but nevertheless there are those who propose to take down hydro dams in our rivers. Out west, if you take down the dams, you close the rivers to navigation. Then where do you put the tonnage that goes on the rivers? You put it on the highways.

We have also seen a tremendous increase in natural gas consumption because that is the one area that our electric producing entities can permit. Nevertheless, we have seen gas prices go from \$2.16 per thousand cubic feet last year to somewhere in the area of \$5.40 or \$8.40 or whatever—it has doubled; it has tripled. The realization now is we are pulling down our recoverable gas reserves faster than we are finding new ones.

I am not suggesting we don't have more gas in this country, but we have pretty much identified natural gas as the preferred fuel. Now we are finding ourselves faced with higher prices associated with that.

I have kept oil for the last provision in our dependence because I think it reflects on a little different portion of energy. America moves on oil. We do not move necessarily on natural gas. Our industry depends on natural gas, our power generating on natural gas, our homes by natural gas, but you don't fly out of Washington, DC, on hot air. You fly out on kerosene in your jet airplane, your bus, your ship. Unfortunately, we have little relief in sight from the standpoint of our dependence being replaced by any other technology.

We talk about fuel cells; we talk about wind, solar panels. We have expended about \$6 billion over the last 5 years developing alternative energy. While that development has made some progress, the unfortunate part is it still only reflects about 4 percent of our overall general mix in energy sources.

What we have attempted to do in our bill, Senator BREAUX and myself, is to concentrate to a large degree on increasing the supply by using technology to develop more efficiently,

more effectively, with smaller footprints.

We have also had a bill that has been introduced. I would classify this at least initially as a partisan bill introduced by my good friend Senator BINGAMAN, with whom I share responsibility on Energy, as chairman of the committee—he is the ranking member—and Senator DASCHLE. They introduced a partisan bill. The rationale behind many of our initiatives is similar. In the area of tax initiatives, they are nearly identical. Both have marginal wells, energy efficiency, renewable, accelerating depreciation, infrastructure, other nontax provisions, electric reliability, and Price Anderson issues that address liability on nuclear plants, and alternative fuels.

However, there are some significant differences. I would like to point those out at this time.

There is very little in this bill about existing older coal-fired plants that generate a significant portion of the energy in this country in the form of electricity.

There is nothing substantial for nuclear. I have indicated that nuclear energy provides about 20 percent of the power in this Nation. It is clean. It has no emissions.

As a consequence, more and more utilities are looking at American nuclear. But clearly we have to address the waste issue.

There is no expedited procedure in the Democratic bill for hydro relicensing, which we think is a necessity, because in the interest of safety and efficiency hydro dams need to be relicensed in an expeditious manner.

Lastly, they have not included opening up ANWR—that small sliver of Alaska that we believe has the potential to decrease, if you will, substantially our dependence on imported oil. It will not replace it. I want to make sure everybody recognizes that. It is not the answer to California's energy problem. It never was and never will be. But it certainly is the answer to California's dependence on oil because all the oil that is produced in Alaska is consumed in California, or the State of Washington. Oregon has no refineries. So a portion of the oil from Washington's and California's refineries go to Oregon.

My point is a simple one. As Alaska's oil production declines, California, Washington, and Oregon will continue to need oil.

The question is, Where are they going to get the oil? They are going to bring it in from overseas in foreign vessels, maybe from the rain forests of Colombia or other areas where there is no environmental consideration given for the development of the field, or compatibility of the environment, or compatibility of the landmass where they develop oil, or for the technology that we mandate in developing our own oil fields.

My point is, you might not like oil fields. Prudhoe Bay is the best in the world, bar none. The combination of the environmental oversight by the Federal Government and the EPA and the State of Alaska is second to none. Any spill of an ounce or more has to be reported. Any foreign substance—even throwing out coffee from a cup—requires reporting. That may sound outlandish, but that is the rule. That is the law, and that is the enforcement.

As we look at the decline in production from Alaska and recognize where it is going, and factoring in the reality that our oil under the Jones Act, which mandates that the carriage of goods between two American ports must be in U.S. flag vessels that are crewed by union members, that are in ships built in U.S. yards, which provides jobs for Americans as opposed to foreign ships that are coming in that aren't built to U.S. standards and don't have the same requirements of Coast Guard inspections, and so forth.

There is a significant issue for Washington, Oregon, and California.

The merits of opening ANWR speak for themselves. Can you do it safely? Clearly we can. We have the experience. Is the area at risk? Well, those who are opposed to it would have you believe that ANWR is at risk. But they do not point out the reality that ANWR is the size of the State of South Carolina. It is roughly 19 million acres. In that 19 million acres, we have set aside 8.5 million acres in the wilderness in perpetuity and another 9 million acres has been set aside in the refuge, leaving up at the top for Congress and only Congress to determine what is the so-called 1002 area consisting of 1.5 million acres.

That is what is at risk—1.5 million acres out of 19 million acres. And industry says if oil is found there in the range that it believes exist—somewhere between 5.6 billion barrels and 16 billion barrels—the footprint would be about 1,000, or 2,000 acres.

That is about half the size of the Dulles International Airport, to give you some idea of the magnitude.

Is that permissible? We think it is. Do we have the technology? We think we do.

If the oil is there in that abundance—10 million barrels a day—it would equal Prudhoe Bay. Prudhoe Bay has produced for 27 years about 20 to 25 percent of the total crude oil produced in the United States. Now it is beginning to decline. It has, nevertheless, exceeded its production prediction which was 10 billion barrels. It has produced over 13 billion barrels.

My point is that ANWR and that particular field that is believed to be there would be the largest oil field found in the world in the last 40 years. Some people say it is only a 6-month supply. That is assuming all the rest of the oil production stops. It is a ridiculous ar-

gument. It is similar to us saying that Alaska is going to withhold development of ANWR, and therefore you are not going to have a 6-month supply of oil. It is a ridiculous argument. It needs to be tossed aside. It is amazing that the media believes it is going to take 10 years to develop. It is not going to be 10 years. We can develop that in 3 years. We already have an 800-mile pipeline. It utilizes half the capacity. We need an extension of about 26 miles of pipeline, which takes us from the field on State land on the edge of ANWR, and we can begin to produce oil.

The difficulty I have with the Democratic bill is ANWR is not in it. I think as we look at trying to find relief, we have to look at home, and we have to recognize that we can do it safely. I have already indicated prominent justification for that.

The other issue is what is going on with the economy. The economy in this country is in the dumps. How much of it is the cost, if you will, of increased energy? Look at Fortune 500 fourth-quarter earnings. They all indicate that they were substantially affected by the increased costs of energy. It affected their bottom line. It affected their employment. It affected their inventory.

Again, it is an economic factor, and it is a significant one as we look at the contribution that this could make in our own economy. It is a significant creator of jobs.

There are virtually thousands and thousands of jobs associated with opening up this oil field. We don't make pipe in Alaska. We don't make valves. We don't have the welders. It is estimated that about 750,000 jobs are associated with this effort.

I want to make sure everybody understands the significance of what it means to the economy.

Finally, the national security interests of this country: when do we compromise our national security? At what point do we become so dependent on oil imports that we compromise that?

I was asked that question. I said, well, remember in 1973 and 1974 when we had the oil embargo. We had gas lines around the block. People were indignant, and they were blaming government. We said we will never approach 50-percent dependence.

So we created the Strategic Petroleum Reserve with a 90-day supply. We never reached that goal. We reached about a 56-day supply. When we pulled our oil out under the previous administration—about 30 million barrels—we suddenly found that we didn't have the refining capacity to refine the oil. We had to replace what we were importing by opening SPR.

My point is we have restrictions in our energy situation. And it is not limited to supply. It is partially limited to the capacity we have because we

haven't built a new refinery in this country in 25 years. We shut down nearly 100 in the last decade.

Here we find ourselves in a situation where we fought a war in 1991. We lost 147 lives. We had 437 Americans wounded. How quickly we forget. Who was that war against? It was against Iraq and Saddam Hussein. We are now importing nearly 700,000 barrels a day from Iraq. Yet we have flown 234,000 individual sorties over Iraq enforcing the no-fly zone. We have been very fortunate. We have not lost any men or women. But they are shot at, believe me. It is a very dangerous situation.

So here we become dependent, if you will, in a few years, to a degree, on oil from an aggressor, a tyrant. It is kind of interesting to proceed a little further with this evaluation of our national security interests. Because, as we look to Saddam Hussein, what we do is we take his oil, we refine it, put it in our airplanes and go bomb him. Maybe it is not that simple, but I think there is justification for at least that kind of a premise being rationalized.

What does he do with the money he gets? He pays his Republican Guards to keep him alive. And then he develops a missile capability, a delivery capability, a significant biological capability. And at whom does he aim it? At one of our closest allies, Israel. I don't know what that does to your digestion, Mr. President, but it bothers mine.

Is it in our country's national security interest to continue to depend more and more on imported oil? I do not think so. We can reduce that dramatically. Currently we are 56-percent dependent on imported oil. If Congress authorized the opening of ANWR tomorrow, we would send a signal to OPEC that we mean business about reducing our dependence. That would send a strong signal. I think they would increase production and the price would drop.

However, we cannot seem to come to grips with this problem because of the environmental opposition based on emotion, not sound science, based on membership, pressure on members, the realization that the environmental community needs a cause, the realization the environmental community will not address its responsibility to increase supply, if you will.

Why is that increase necessary? We are simply using more energy as we know and learn how to conserve more. We are an electronic society. We move on e-mails. We move on computers. We are expanding. The requirements associated with our structural society—including air-conditioning—suggest we are going to continue to use more.

They say we can conserve our way out. We can no more conserve our way out than we can drill our way out. We need all the sources of energy. We need the technology. And a significant portion, as far as oil is concerned, is ANWR.

So that is why, as we look at the four issues—safety, yes, it can be done safely; the effect on the economy; the national security; and, most of all, the attitude of the people in Alaska—75 percent support it. We have Native people, Eskimos who are here in Washington, calling on Members saying: Hey, this is a personal issue. We live there. We live in the village of Kaktovik, which is in ANWR. We have a school there. We have a radar site there. There are 227 people who live there. We have a right to life and disposition on our own land and a right of expression.

So when the environmentalists say, it is an untouched Serengeti, they are misleading the public. Most of ANWR is untouched and will always remain untouched. But this little segment where the people live is the area where the oil would be drilled.

So we are disappointed with the Democratic bill because it does not include ANWR.

I have a couple more things to say, and then I will try to wind this up.

In the Democratic bill, in our opinion, there are extremely broad research and development authorizations on the issue of climate change provisions which might be dealt with better in a separate entity. We are all concerned about global warming and concerned about climate change. But the idea of drifting towards a Kyoto accord, I think most Members have indicated by that vote last year of 98-0 that the proposal before the Senate was simply unacceptable. The reason is, it would allow the developing nations to catch up with the developed nations instead of the developed nations using our technology to assist the developing nations in reducing their emissions.

Finally, the Democratic proposal has an inconsistency in one sense. It does not address, as I have indicated, looking for oil at home; namely, ANWR, even though the residents of my State support it, but it does propose lease sale 181 in the gulf right off Florida. The Democratic proposal states that we should take the lead in meeting the energy needs using indigenous resources.

What I am saying is the Democratic proposal opposes ANWR, which the State of Alaska clearly supports, but wants to force lease sale 181, which Florida opposes—the Governor of Florida and the people of Florida—which is a bit of an inconsistency. Perhaps there will be an explanation on it.

They want to shut ANWR permanently, but, by the same token, they want to accelerate the export of Alaskan natural gas. That is kind of an interesting comparison because there is a difference of how we propose to develop Alaska's gas. They propose a section 29 tax incentive for production of natural gas from Alaska.

It is interesting to reflect on what section 29 means. Section 29 is designed

as an incentive for development of unconventional sources of energy, not conventional sources.

What am I talking about? For example, overlaying Prudhoe Bay, we have what we call the West Sack Field. It is larger than Prudhoe Bay, but the oil is immersed in the sands, and the sands are in permafrost, and the technology of recovery is simply not in existence. The oil is there.

So in our bill we have a proposed subsidy for developing that technology. We have, in our bill, under section 9, an incentive for developing biomass technology, coalbed methane technology. But surprisingly enough—and I do not mean to kick a gift horse in the mouth or the teeth or the behind or wherever—they propose this section 29 in Alaska's potential natural gas development.

Under our proposal, the Alaska natural gas project would not be available for any type of section 29 subsidy. There is a reason for that. In our case, the gas has been found. We found 36 trillion cubic feet of gas associated with oil development in Prudhoe Bay. The geologists will not even get a recognition for finding a gas well. The emphasis was on an oil well.

So we found this gas. We discovered it. Furthermore, we have produced it. We produced it by pulling it out and re-injecting it into the oil wells to get greater recovery. So the gas is still there. But to suggest that Exxon, British Petroleum, and Phillips are looking for an incentive—a tax incentive under section 29—I do not mean to speak out of school, but we are just amazed they would include a subsidy to big oil for a project that is already proven, already found. The technology is available. All we need is the transportation to get it out.

So, once again, we see Members of Congress trying to determine what is in the best interests of Alaska without talking to Alaskans or understanding our point of view or giving us the courtesy.

Finally, for the record, we have had long debates on this issue of whether or not we could open ANWR safely. We have had long debates on the issue of our national security interests, of the numbers of lives we have lost over oil.

I remember Mark Hatfield, a very senior Member of this body, from the State of Oregon, saying: I would vote for ANWR any day in the world if it meant not sending another American soldier overseas to fight a war in a foreign country over oil.

Well, the final word—and this is from Representative RALPH HALL, a Democrat from Texas, who said Tuesday in a speech before the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—and I quote:

I would drill in a cemetery if it kept my grandkids out of body bags.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

## RESTORING A NATIONAL COMMITMENT TO MISSILE DEFENSE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, in his recent address to Congress, President George W. Bush made it clear that, unlike his immediate predecessor, he strongly endorses the deployment of an effective missile defense system capable of protecting the United States, its allies and its forward deployed forces from the growing threat of missile attack. As someone who has long viewed the deployment of missile defense as an urgent national priority, I look forward to working with President Bush to achieve this vital national security goal for America.

March 23 marks the 18th anniversary of President Ronald Reagan's historic speech announcing his determination to see America build a defense against ballistic missiles. It is gratifying to know that Reagan's vision remains alive today. As Reagan said in 1983:

What if free people could live secure in the knowledge that their security did not rest upon the threat of instant U.S. retaliation to deter a Soviet attack, that we could intercept and destroy strategic ballistic missiles before they reached our own soil or that of our allies?

I know this is a formidable technical task, one that may not be accomplished before the end of this century. . . . It will take years, probably decades of effort on many fronts. There will be failures and setbacks, just as there will be successes and breakthroughs . . . as we pursue a program to begin to achieve our ultimate goal of eliminating the threat posed by strategic nuclear missiles.

Now, 18 years later, at the dawn of the new century, a renewed Presidential focus on missile defense is appropriate and necessary. The threat posed by ballistic missiles and weapons of mass destruction is very real and growing. And as we have seen over time, the technology to begin to meet this threat is available, if we will make the effort to aggressively develop it. Today, President Bush promises to do just that.

Unfortunately, the Clinton administration squandered most of the last 8 years, failing to build a proper foundation for the kind of robust missile defense development and deployment which the growing threat demands. Wedded to the outdated 1972 ABM Treaty, to the superstitions of arms control and to greatly reduced defense budgets, Clinton was consistently hostile to the deployment of effective missile defense. Here is a quick year-by-year review of some of the highlights of the Clinton administration's dismal record on missile defense.

1993: cut \$2.5 billion from the Bush missile defense budget request for fiscal year 1994; halted all cooperation with Russia on a joint global missile defense program; terminated the Reagan-Bush Strategic Defense Initiative program; downgraded National Missile Defense to a research and development program only; cut 5-year